OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Perfect. Alright, well, we're recording. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone, and apologies for the start of this call being delayed due to technical problems. It's the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance on the 20th of June, 2017. Today, we're going to be focusing on the responses to the questions from the GNSO and the ccNSO about the amended charter. Let's do a quick roll call, please, before we plow straight into the work.
DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay. Unfortunately, because of the setup, I'm unable to see most of the people in the room. I know that we have Marilyn Cade, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, I heard Jim Prendergast earlier today, Rafik Dammak, and I think for staff we have Nigel Hickson and Veni Markovski, and myself, Desiree Cabrera. If I didn't announce your name, could you please speak up and let us know that you're in the room?
BERRY COB:	Berry Cobb is here.
MARILYN CADE:	And it would probably be good if you identify who you're with, whether you're with ICANN staff or which organization. It's Marilyn Cade, I'm with the Business Constituency.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anyone else? I see on the Adobe Connect that there were a couple of people who might have not joined the call yet, such as Abdeljalil Bachar Bong, Jennifer Chung and Hector Ariel Manoff.

Let's get going. Rafik, you're on the call. Should I hand the floor over to you so you take us through the comments and how we're going to be responding? Just as a quick [inaudible] you've seen my personal comments shared –

MARILYN CADE: Excuse me, Olivier. Mary Uduma has asked to have a dial-out.

DESIREE CABRERA: Hi, Marilyn. Yes, I'm currently dialing out to her right now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thanks for this, Marilyn, for pointing this out. So, Rafik, just as a quick intro, I've sent some personal comments to the mailing list regarding the questions that have been asked. I think they come into two basic questions. One being whether the CCWG on Internet Governance is the correct vehicle to do the work, basically, that we're doing, and the second set of questions is whether the charter fully reflects properly the work that we're doing with the request from several people that we focus more on listing and laying out the work that this working group does, including on whether it has the ability to draft papers independently of ICANN staff and independently of the ICANN Board. And I guess by extension, they're also independently of the chartering organizations, which I think is obviously not the case. So,

Rafik, I'll hand the floor over to you to take us through this, please, and how you want to work is really in your hand. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. So, maybe to add more to the context, the topic regarding CCWG-IG was in the GNSO Council agenda for several conf. calls since Copenhagen meeting. In the beginning, there was not enough time to discuss the agenda, but on the last call, there were several comments from Councilors, most of them from the contracted parties. We get as a comment and question that's coming from Donna Austin who's also the Vice Chair, and my understanding is that she is carrying the kind of question from the Registry Stakeholder Group.

As you mentioned, there are questions about if it's the right vehicle or not, but also kind of concern about the mission of the working group, and maybe that's not enough clear in the charter. The CCWG-IG is, again, a topic for discussion for next week in the public meeting, but it's not, I'd say, tabled for any decision, just discussion, the continuation of what we had before. There was even talk if there should be a motion to continue or withdraw the support of the GNSO as the chartering organization.

So, that's kind of the current situation, and today Bart, the ccNSO staff also sent out a question from the ccNSO. This is the kind of two sets of questions we have. I think in terms of action, we can state that the situation of the CCWG-IG is for discussion for the ccNSO and GNSO, and at least is in the agenda for one of them in the Johannesburg meeting. So, maybe we don't need to have an official response for that, but we

do need to go through those questions and the concerns that were raised and try to elaborate some answers. I think [Yuri] and also I think Greg shared some thought of how we can respond to that. So, I think we can first try to collect or compile several answers from the members of the group and see how we can try to clarify any concern coming from the GNSO list.

Should we go through questions [as] comment by comment, or how should we proceed here, Olivier?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: As we've got limited time, we should probably go through comment by comment, perhaps.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. I think we can –

MARILYN CADE: Excuse me. Can I ask a quick question? Do we think that we all fully understand the risk and threats to ICANN and that we have properly articulated those? Because one of the things I see in these questions is a failure to actually understand that ICANN is very much under assault, and as a result of that, in particular the contracted parties are at risk. And I think these questions don't really properly reflect an understanding. So, I just want to ask, do we think we actually articulate why the CCWG-IG exists and what the risks and threats are that are current? I'm not saying we pause to do that now, but I want to ask the

question. Have we properly articulated that, and is that something we should do?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Olivier, I see that you're in queue. Please, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Rafik. In response to Marilyn, I think we have listed some of those threats in our annual report that we did write, the one that we sent to the SOs and ACs. And I do note that we haven't received any feedback on that, unfortunately. Now, whether we need to actually have those included in the charter is interesting, because it might be worth listing some of those threats or at least summarizing these in one of the introductory parts, the one that basically says, "Why is that Cross-Community Working Group required?"

However, I have noticed though from the points that were made that everyone seems to be saying that they see that the working group in itself is currently worth pursuing as in – sorry, the work of the working group is worth it. Perhaps not in the ccNSO comments, but the GNSO comments seem to be pointing to, "Well, it's an important thing that needs to happen. The question is whether the CCWG is the right vehicle for it." So, I see this more as a technical question rather than questioning the worth of the working group itself and of the work itself. I'd be interested to hear if anybody else has other perspectives on that.

MARY UDUMA: Hello, my name is Mary. Can I speak? Hello, can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, please go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Okay. I'm just thinking that after reading these comments when they were initially posted, I was also thinking along the lines of Olivier that the work is appreciated, the output is understood, but maybe the nomenclature or the setup of CCWG is not the right vehicle. Or we look at the [inaudible] for ICANN if you have a CCWG, it should have a tenure and when [we should end it] [inaudible]. In this group, I don't see this group falling into [inaudible]. So, I don't think anything is wrong with the charter.

What I think is maybe probably would look at other vehicles and not CCWG, since there are set requirements or set criteria for establishing a CCWG. So, we'll look at other things. Because I think this is an important group for ICANN, knowing and hearing and witnessing what has been happening. ICANN is under attack, and we need this group to be able to speak for it.

Thank you. That's my comment on that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mary. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik, and thanks for these points, Mary. You mentioned use another type of vehicle. What would you have in mind? What would you suggest? I'm quite flexible on this, but my big concern is I don't know if there's any other type of vehicle that has so far been defined in the ICANN community. And as we know, we like things to be defined before using them. And should we think of defining something? Or has work already been done on that?

MARY UDUMA: Okay. Can I respond? I have been looking at [inaudible] on IG, which will involve every other community. So, if it is looked at as a steering committee on ICANN, or a working – I don't know whether a working party works in ICANN, or I think working party – I used to know about this in ITU as a working party, or is this study group? I don't know whether – in ITU, we talk about study group, and I thought of [inaudible] I thought of study group, I thought of working party. So, probably other people might have better idea or better name [inaudible] the one that can fit in, but as it stands, it seems to me that the CCWG [inaudible] may not work for this group, because it's not a group that's ending soon. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mary. Maybe trying to respond to Olivier here, we were tasked in the beginning to kind of use the framework for a Cross-Community Working Group, and that's why we did the amendment based on the kind of template and trying to fill any gaps. But maybe we can clarify

EN

some parts to add more details and to articulate more. As you said, we are still kind of [inaudible] more technical here or structural question, if it's the right group or not. I'm not sure.

I remember, I recall getting a kind of document from GNSO staff about possible structure used by the GNSO, but there is none that is for cross-community. There are maybe some more ad hoc, but we never tested for our case. So, we may work on that if we get more time, but I'm not sure if we can really deliver something that will satisfy the GNSO on that matter. Yes, Olivier, I see that you're in the queue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Rafik. I've been reading through the charter and the goals and objectives. And looking at these goals and objectives, thinking, "Well, if we use another vehicle, would that be possible in another vehicle?" So, when it comes out to increasing awareness about relevance Internet governance and policy issues in the ICANN community, enhancing cooperation between the working group and ICANN government engagement functions on Internet governance matters, all of that I think is probably possible through another type of vehicle.

The one thing which I think might not be possible through a vehicle that is not a formal vehicle such as the CCWG-IG is one where if the working group was to be consulted – well, yes, that the working group itself would be a sounding board or be consulted by staff or by the ICANN Board on a specific issue was to draft a paper, draft something and then ask its respective chartering organizations for ratification.

That's one thing which I think can only be done – as far as I understand – in a working group, in a Cross-Community Working Group fashion. Any other vehicle would not allow it to do so, because the working group would be writing something that the SOs and ACs could completely disregard, that has no way to be voted on or checked about, and therefore the response that the working group might need to give to the ICANN global government engagement or to the ICANN Board would basically be worth nothing, but just that of a group of people that sits around a table and talks about things. That's my understanding of it.

Now, I don't know, because I know that there's a Cross-Community Working Party vehicle that has been used for the human rights work. What I do note from that though – and by the way, I was the person who recommended that it would be a working party to start with because of the complexities with creating a Cross-Community Working Group back then and because the human rights topic needed to be addressed as quickly as possible. The work of the working party has been one of just coordination between different people in ICANN, but the actual outputs and the actual formal work has then had to end up as one of the accountability Work Stream 2 threads work.

I'm not aware that the working party as such has any standing in ICANN by itself, except it does have the ability to have some staff support and some calls that [inaudible]. But there's no actual output of the Cross-Community Working Party. It's the output of Work Stream 2 on Accountability. And correct me if I'm wrong, please. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Am I correct? I'm asking a question here.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. I think regarding the human rights working party, it's not chartered by SO and ACs, and so it's kind of more an ad hoc space for likeminded people who wanted to work the human rights issue, and so they get kind of even then some support, but not from ICANN. So, definitely I don't think it's the right vehicle. I understand there was some group including the ALAC, they had the working party on other topics, but – so, the question – I can share the least of what GNSO used before as structure, but I'm not sure how much time we can spend on that if we don't know exactly what are the criteria that we're trying to match for the GNSO to be accepted.

I think the point as discussed maybe in the chat is maybe there are several questions about the output and the deliverable. Seems like we had that question about the position paper and so on. So, I guess we need to clarify maybe more and highlight how we are going to manage the deliverable and [inaudible]. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks, Rafik. And I hope that others will be able to chime in as well on this. I note there's much going on in the chat. The single most repeated concern about the work that we do being in a CCWG is that it doesn't have a start, a beginning, a middle and an end. I've heard that,

Mary has repeated it as well on the call today. It does not have that. And some are basically saying, well, if that's the case, then we're trying to fit a round ball into a square [thing.]

NIGEL HICKSON: This is ludicrous. We've addressed this point on numerous calls. By altering the charter so that we report every two years on specific targets and objectives and how we've met that, we comply with that requirement on the Cross-Community Working Group on Working Groups. So, I don't see that as an issue. That's a false issue, as they say. One can oppose the whole nature of the Cross-Community Working Group, but by saying it doesn't have a start or an end, that's just not right.

MARY UDUMA: Hello. Can I get clarification from Nigel? Are you saying that this working group has a start and it has an end? When is the end? It has started the working. When will it end?

NIGEL HICKSON: Mary, you recall in the changes to the charter that we made, we specifically put in provision that every two years, we would effectively renew the objectives and the targets and the milestones on this particular issue. So, it gets around the problem of the fact that Internet governance issues – unless we get taken over by the UN and therefore there is no ICANN and therefore we would come to an end, or there is some other failing in the system – the issues of Internet governance are

not time limited while ICANN exists. Therefore, what we can do is we can have time limited objectives where after two years, we come back. And then of course, the chartering organizations after every two years can reflect on the work that the cross-community work has done, and can opine on whether it's useful and whether it meets those objectives. But by saying now that it's – yes, and that's what we can do.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you, Nigel.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. And thanks to Nigel for pointing this. That's probably a good answer to provide. The next question then is to do with a more detailed schedule of the papers that would be written, or of the input that would be provided. My own feeling on this is that we can't predict what is going to come up at the forthcoming IGF or at the forthcoming WiGig or the forthcoming WTDC, or whatever is coming up in the next two years. So, providing a detailed plan of what we're going to be writing in the next two years I thought was a bit of a challenge.

Now, perhaps Nigel knows better than that, I don't know. And perhaps others have ideas on how to go around that question.

MARILYN CADE:	I haven't figured out how to raise my hand since I'm on my phone. Can I speak on that?
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Yes, Marilyn. Please go ahead.
MARILYN CADE:	Thanks. Look, I think the deliverables we provide are also – I'm going to call them briefings, awareness events. I posted in the chat – I'm going to say documents that summarize that, how that's been distributed into certain other events. The WSIS forum was an example. It could be that the workshop that we proposed for IGF is another example. But I think the big issue here is we could list examples of past activities and – I'm just reading now, yes, [inaudible] past activities, past outputs so that they understand [unless that] we always take consultation on those. I think if we do that, we can also throw down the concern to – typically, the usual outputs include workshop at this event, at this event, summary papers about activities that could be posted online, but we're really clear that we always take consultation on those.
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Thanks, Marilyn. Okay, so I see we have even in the chat a discussion about the deliverable, and if we should kind of give the example of what delivered before, and maybe adding even that as kind of supplement or annex to the charter to highlight what was done before. Okay. Any – yes, Olivier.

MARILYN CADE: Olivier –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'll let Marilyn speak, because I was just going to ask – so, you're basically saying that we should take whatever we said in our annual report and said, "Okay, that's what we've done," put this in the charter and say, "That's the type of work that we will do in the next two years?"

MARILYN CADE: Well, I'm thinking we have a look at that as an example. But [I think also Jim] seems to have said that we made a contribution to WTSA and I think he should describe his concerns, because he's coming across as concerned.

JIM PREDNERGAST: Yes, sure. No, Marilyn, what I said is – I'm trying to explain what I'm hearing from others. These are not my concerns.

MARILYN CADE: No, but that is feedback that's helpful.

JIM PREDNERGAST: I know, but again, it's not my feedback. It's what I'm hearing from others and what I'm reading between the tea leaves some of the [inaudible]

MARILYN CADE: But Jim, I don't recall that we have a [WTSA submission].

JIM PREDNERGAST: I wasn't on the ground, so I know Nigel was there, I know there were – Olivier I think may have even held the pen. There was a rapid fire exercise to try to respond to one of the contributions from one of the countries that came in during [inaudible] that specifically spoke to the role of ICANN, and I believe ITU. Going back eight months here. There was a –

NIGEL HICKSON: [inaudible]

JIM PREDNERGAST: Sorry, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I'm sorry, I shouldn't have interrupted you. Carry on, I'll come in [inaudible]

JIM PREDNERGAST: No, help me out, because I'm actually – you probably remember it better than I do.

NIGEL HICKSON: This is where the Cross-Community Working Group were consulted, or some members obviously knew what was going on anyway, as much as

staff. This is a feature of the usefulness of this group. It's not always staff that tell the community what's happening, but sometimes community tells the organization what's happening. On this issue, there was the African Union proposal which touched on county code names and wanted to amend that proposal to cover generic names. So, they're proposing that the working group – one of the ITU working groups should have a [inaudible] on generic top level domains. So, that was the proposal we consulted on. Yes. Thanks.

JIM PREDNERGAST: Right, and there was a document that was developed by this group that – I don't know whatever happened to it, but what I heard through some of the other folks was that we as the chartering organizations were never consulted on that. Now, whether or not that document went anywhere, I can't recall. I don't think it did. But that's a process issue that is looming over all of this. How do you keep the chartering organizations in the loop on what's happening here so they feel as though they're not getting surprised by things that happen too quickly for them?

MARILYN CADE: Sure, Jim. I'm going to respond. The chartering organizations have appointed members of this group, [I being] from the BC. So, that's my responsibility to feed back. As I recall, this was an informational update, not a position. But I think it's really helpful you've identified this as a concern, but I also think we need to ask our own members if you were sent to us as an official member and you're not feeding back to the

group and then feeding back to the CCWG, then we have to fix that too. Right?

JIM PREDNERGAST: Yes. I'm just an observer.

MARILYN CADE: No, I think this is very helpful. But the fact is this working group, like every working group, has designated participants sent from each of the constituencies and other groups, and then we decided to let all observers and participants be treated on equal footing. So, I think we need to take up – maybe not right now, but we need to really – yes, [inaudible] I fully agree with you. If you're a rep on the CCWG and you're not stepping up to the feedback and creating a birth to a circle, we need to ask ourselves – and I'm not – yes, I agree. Jim is very helpful, he's just telling us about this. But we need to maybe have a – maybe within our – look at who's there who has an assignment, "Are you feeding back to your group?" And if not, then let's figure out how we improve that.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Rafik. In the chat, I've put a link to that statement. We were very open and very transparent on this. There was a Google Doc that was opened, there was a wiki page that was extensively shared

with everyone, and that wiki page has now the link to the working draft, the Google Doc, and [it goes] the CCWG-IG statement on WTSA proposal resolution 47. It is – as you well note – an internal note that was sent to the ASO, the GNSO, the ccNSO, the GAC, the ALAC and the SSAC. Why this hasn't been received by any of these is beyond my understanding. I can't remember – I can check what channels we used to send this out. I don't know whether we sent this out within or respective representatives that are there. You'll note that it was sent further than actually just to the chartering organizations, because it was at the time felt that it was something that needed to be brought to the attention of the whole ICANN community, and so further than just the three chartering organizations that we have.

So, I'm quite surprised then that this has been taken against this working group. To me, it demonstrates a total misunderstanding of what this – not only the working group does but what this topic is about, and I'm particularly concerned about this. It's surprising that the information is there, we send things out, and then it doesn't get acted upon and afterwards, we're told, "Oh, you haven't told us about this," when really, the error and the lack of process is, I'm afraid, not in our court. I can certainly check how this was transmitted to the chartering organizations and to those organizations that are listed, and it might be that at the end, we didn't obtain consensus to send it out, in which case that's even a nonevent. But I'll check now. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. I guess maybe we need to clarify that, who is responsible. Maybe it's us as co-Chairs to make sure of that but also

GNSO has a liaison to the working group, so I suppose to share any information or feedback with the council and to – anyway, I guess we can clarify that if we'll ask [about].

Olivier, I see that your hand is still up. Did you want to comment further? Okay, that's an old hand.

Okay, so we have five minutes remaining of the call, and so maybe we can try here to summarize what can be our initial response or how we can proceed here. It seems there is some consensus that maybe we need to explain about some elements like the term limit. Also, I think there is consensus maybe we cannot really spend time to work in the vehicle and the current structure is appropriate.

Also, I see that for example maybe miscommunication or how to inform our chartering organization about such outcome. But again, I will have to maybe we should think how we can respond to the discussion in the next week. So, it will be ongoing. Okay. Any suggestion or comment here how shall we proceed, or are we fine to [inaudible]

MARILYN CADE: Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: I had posted earlier, I think you have to start talking at the constituency level, frankly, and just listening. I know this is not true of all constituencies, but at least to the BC, the IPC and the ISP, they vote under instruction, which means it's best to actually work – talk directly to the full constituency group. I'm not commenting on any other constituency's perspective, I'm just saying I think [inaudible] there is a real misunderstanding, and I will support Jim's comment.

Thank you, Jim. You called it a marketing problem. I was going to call it a communication problem, but I think it's the same thing. Why don't we try to get back in the next few days to what's the problem that the CCWG-IG was setup to address, identify and explain that each constituency group does have a member as well as other participants, identify who they are, and then kind of go forth and explain. But I'm a fan of being accountable. So, to me, I would prefer we convince and educate that we can be accountable. We might need some [inaudible] in how we do that, but we want to be accountable.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. Thanks, Marilyn. I guess we should continue the discussion on the mailing list, and indeed that every representative should kind of liaise with his own group and share information. Yes, Olivier. You want to add something?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much, Rafik. You'll note that I've just put a link in the chat which is a link of an e-mail I'd sent to the Cross-Community Working Group mailing list that provides a confirmation of the e-mail

that I sent on the 29th of October to all of the SO and AC Chairs: James Bladel, Katrina Sataki, Alan Greenberg, Patrik Fältström, with a copy to GNSO Secretariat, to At-Large staff, to Thomas Schneider, to the ASO Secretariat, and to Louie Lee as well who is in the ASO.

There was no response [from them], and I think that the e-mail is quite clear, that this is just a statement that is for information purposes for them to read, to be aware of what's going on. I thought this was actually a perfect example of this working group doing the work that it was supposed to do.

If it's not the work that it's supposed to do and not the work that chartering organizations would like – and I'm saying this for the record – then let's close this down, because I just don't see what would be the work of a working group that doesn't actually provide advice and alert the community to the extreme dangers that we have out there that the community seems to be totally unaware of and not particularly interested in since there was absolutely no response to the particular statement. Thanks.

MARY UDUMA: Just for clarification, do we have example in ICANN such that a Cross-Community Working Group [inaudible] are not established by or called for by the chartered organizations in ICANN or the ccNSO or the GNSO or At-Large? Is there any one that has organically grown, organically come to be? Because if this Cross-Community Working Group [inaudible] chartered organization, maybe it would have been a different thing altogether. So, probably have a look at it. [inaudible]

EN

because of the way it came to be that it grew up organically, not from the chartering organizations.

NIGEL HICKSON: Hello, can I just – I apologize, but I have to go to another call. But I'm happy in the next couple of days to try and do a bit of drafting if that might be useful. Obviously, others are more expert, but I can come up with a couple of suggestions if that's useful. But perhaps you can let me know after the call. But I must go now. Thanks.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you, Nigel.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And if I could jump in, the way the working group started – I'll be very brief, by the way – was the NCUC met with the ALAC in Buenos Aires a couple of years ago. They put together an informal working group that was then announced by the then ICANN CEO as being a great example of a Cross-Community Working Group, which it wasn't. It was just a – as in by definition, it was just a working group of constituency and an ICANN Advisory Committee. But very quickly, within a matter of days, the requests were received from the GNSO and the ccNSO that they should be part of this and not just something with one of the GNSO's constituencies.

So, it's not a case of having pushed communities to join this. It was a little strange, of course, that it started just as a small working group and then grew very quickly, but the requests to join that working group

were made by the GNSO and by the ccNSO. They were the formal chartering [inaudible] and the formal appointment of Chairs as well. So, I don't think this could be seen as being something that was set up without the approval of the chartering organizations.

MARY UDUMA: In that case, we have then is properly constituted, is properly formed, so it's just for us to – as Marilyn said – exercise and get more support so that they'll react, the ccNSO and GNSO will react and so forth the work. And as we have said on this call that the charter [inaudible] some of the intervention, or some of the [inaudible] or some of the things that this group had done in the past for and on behalf of ICANN [inaudible] and also be able to put the narratives there so that it would be understood. Seems to me that some don't understand the essence.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Mary. [inaudible] I think most of the people are leaving the call, and maybe and so maybe time to wrap [up] and just to agree on the action items and the follow-up. So, I understand that Nigel is volunteering to start drafting, but also we should continue discussion on the mailing list. I think Olivier, you made some proposal, [inaudible] and so we can try to – going through the transcript and see – also the Adobe Connect chat and try to compile all that and see how we can move forward from here. We have also an agenda item for next week and the face-to-face meeting for the CCWG-IG, so we can continue also discussion there.

Any comment, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Rafik. I think you've summarized it very well. On the action items, certainly, I think we've got enough material to provide some answers to some of the questions that have been asked. I don't know whether you want to be tasked to respond to these, so to send the proposed responses to the mailing list in the next couple of days, and then we can respond certainly before we travel and before we meet face-to-face in Johannesburg. I'm a little concerned that answering then might be too late. I am having a feel of the dynamics being that the GNSO Chair would like to get this issue decided on sooner rather than later, and I'm not sure whether it will be time enough to provide answers or coordinate answers by the next Monday which is the meeting with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. For now, there's no motion in the GNSO Council public meeting, so it's a discussion item. So, the discussion will continue, and since it's also in the public meeting, there is a possibility for people to intervene then in the queue. So, we have to continue and try to kind of articulate our response and see how things will go anyway, and maybe try to think what kind of question we also can get, try to put ourselves in their place and see what kind of concerns and inquiries we may get and try to respond to that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rafik, I think we received most of the questions already. One more action item I was going to ask is that the working group asks the ccNSO

if it needs any – because we have received questions from the ccNSO. We haven't touched on those on today's call. If we – there was the opportunity to meet with the ccNSO at some point during the face-to-face meeting, if they we're interested in discussing their questions and we could provide some answers. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess with that, with this action item I guess we can adjourn the call for today and follow up later on the mailing list, and the next week in the face-to-face meeting. Thanks all for attending this call. See you soon. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]